annoys the party so deceived. Where such a right is proven and its violation proven, the chancellor is able to shape a decree which may be as effective a remedy as the particular case may demand.

We called attention to this extension of equity jurisdiction in our comments upon the great New Jersey case of Vanderbilt *v.* Mitchell, 65 Cent. L. J. 35. The same question was before the Supreme Court of New York (trial term) in the recent case of Randazzo *v.* Roppolo, 105 N. Y. Supp. 481, where the court held that where defendant went through the form of a marriage ceremony with a man impersonating plaintiff, plaintiff, though not entitled to an annulment of the certificate of marriage filed with the bureau of vital statistics, nor to an annulment of the marriage, was entitled to a judicial determination that he was not at the time and place stated in the certificate married to the defendant, and to an injunction restraining her from claiming to be his wife.—Cent. Law Journal.

Interstate Commerce in Intoxicating Liquors.—In Adams Express Company *v.* Commonwealth of Kentucky, 27 Supreme Court Reporter, 606, 206 U. S. 129, 51 L. Ed. 987, the United States Supreme Court takes the position that an agreement by a local agent of an express company to hold for a few days a C. O. D. interstate shipment of intoxicating liquors, to suit the convenience of the consignee in paying for such liquors, and taking it away, does not destroy the character of the transaction as interstate commerce, so as to render the express company amenable to prosecution for violating a state local option law. This decision is based on the recent case of Heyman *v.* Southern R. Co., 203 U. S. 270, 27 Supreme Court Reporter, 104, 51 L. Ed. 178, and by it the Supreme Court reverses the decision of the Kentucky Court of Appeals to the contrary in 27 Ky. Law Rep. 1096, 87 Southwestern Reporter, 1111.

Turntables.—The Supreme Court of Ohio in Wheeling and Lake Erie Railroad *v.* Hafvey, 83 N. E. 66 (Dec. 3rd, 1907), repudiated the doctrine of the Turntable Cases and followed the ruling of the Supreme Court of Virginia in Walker *v.* Potomac, etc., R. Co., 105 Va. 226, 53 S. E. 113, 4 L. R. A. (N. S.), 80, 115 Am. St. Rep. 71, 12 Va. Law Reg. 235.

Use of Public Roads by Automobiles.—The constitutionality of a law regulating the speed of automobiles on public roads, and requiring the licensing of such conveyances, was questioned in State *v.* Swagerty, 102 Southwestern Reporter, 483, on the ground that it was class legislation because applicable only to automobiles. The Missouri Supreme Court in deciding the case was, however, of the opinion that, as the law applies to and affects all parties of the same class, it is not vulnerable to the objection raised.